



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,131	02/25/2004	Hideyuki Okuno	1341.1193	1661
21171	7590	07/16/2008		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER CHONG CRUZ, NADJA N	
			ART UNIT 3623	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/16/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/785,131

Applicant(s)

OKUNO ET AL.

Examiner

NADJA CHONG CRUZ

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 25 February 2004
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This is a Non-Final office action in reply to the application filed on 25 February 2004.
2. Claims 1-21 are currently pending and have been examined.

Priority

3. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application, Foreign Application No. 2003-195733, under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because **Figure 1 and Figure 2, they do not include any reference sign(s)**. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
5. In addition to Replacement Sheets containing the corrected drawing figure(s), applicant is required to submit a marked-up copy of each Replacement Sheet including annotations indicating the changes made to the previous version.

The marked-up copy must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Sheets" and must be presented in the amendment or remarks section that explains the change(s) to the drawings. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)(1). Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing and marked-up copy will result in the abandonment of the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
7. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
8. As per Claims 8 and 10 recites the limitation *the meeting reservation*. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

9. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

10. Claims 13 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. As recited, claims 13-19 are directed toward a computer program, software per se. However, under the current guidelines of 35 USC 101, computer software must be tangibly embodied on a computer readable medium, and, when executed by a computer processor, perform the steps of the software. In their broadest reasonable interpretation and in light of the specification, claims 13-19, as recited, can be interpreted to be embodied on abstract mediums such as carrier waves and signals, and therefore not eligible for patent protection. Accordingly, claims 13-19 are not eligible for patent protection.
11. Claims 20 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to examiners is that a § 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876).
12. An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.
13. Here, applicant's method steps, fail the first prong of the new Federal Circuit decision since they are not tied to another statutory class and can be performed without the use of a particular apparatus. Thus, claims 20-21 are non-statutory since they may be preformed within the human mind.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

15. Claims 1-4, 9, 12-16 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Krasnick et al (US 2002/0032592 A1) hereinafter Krasnick.

Claims 1, 13 and 20:

Krasnick as shown discloses an apparatus, a computer program and method for online planning and managing meetings, the apparatus, computer program and method comprising:

- *a meeting manager that manages* (page 1, ¶ 0009: which teaches "a meeting management module");
- *upon receipt of the meeting information on meetings* (page 1, ¶ 0009: which teaches that "the meeting management module prompts for and collects data pertinent to a proposed meeting, as well as analyzes the collected data and executes arrangements for the meeting" where the meeting management module manages meeting information entered about meetings);
- *from the client terminals* (page 1, ¶ 0009: which teaches that "information is received through "[t]he client interface" which enables "communications between one or more clients" "for online meeting planning for a plurality of clients");
- *the meetings based on meeting registration information* (page 4, ¶ 0046: which teaches that "[t]he attendees can register 108, and are prompted for all information that needs to be gathered from the attendee, including basic user information;");

- *including the meeting information registered with associated meeting identification codes (page 2, ¶ 0030: which teaches that "[t]he registration module 20 prompts for and collects client-related data," (e.g., the meeting information registered) "then generates a login and password based on the same" allowing the client to "gain access to the site" with the purpose that "[t]he meeting planning site information architecture" contains meeting information, "such as selection options to find a meeting package, as well as listing the clients' meetings currently stored on the site and statuses for the meetings". Krasnick suggests that a meeting identification code registers the meeting information associating it with a meeting identification code in order to list the client's meeting currently stored on the site and their statuses);*

Claim 2:

Krasnick as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *further comprising a meeting identification code register that registers the meeting information with associated meeting identification codes (page 2, ¶ 0030 and pages 3-4, ¶ 0044: which teaches that "[t]he registration module 20 prompts for and collects client-related data," (e.g., the meeting information registered) "then generates a login and password based on the same" allowing the client to "gain access to the site" with the purpose that "[t]he meeting planning site information architecture" contains meeting information, "such as selection options to find a meeting package, as well as listing the clients' meetings currently stored on the site and statuses for the meetings". Krasnick suggests that a meeting identification code registers the meeting information associating it with a meeting identification code in order to list the client's meeting currently stored on the site and their statuses);*
- *wherein the meeting manager manages the meetings based on the meeting registration information registered with associated meeting identification codes by the meeting identification code register (page 1, ¶ 0009: which teaches that "the*

meeting management module prompts for and collects data pertinent to a proposed meeting, as well as analyzes the collected data and executes arrangements for the meeting; and the database (or other storage means) houses the collected data." Krasnick suggests that meeting management module gather and store all meeting-related data);

Claim 3:

Krasnick as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *further comprising a meeting database that stores the meeting registration information including the meeting information on the meetings registered with associated meeting identification codes, wherein the meeting manager manages the meetings based on the meeting registration information stored in the meeting database (Figure 3, which it illustrates that Meeting-Related Data are stored in a repository (e.g., database) and Analyze that data (e.g., manages meeting-related information) and page 1, ¶ 0009: which teaches that "the meeting management module prompts for and collects data pertinent to a proposed meeting, as well as analyzes the collected data and executes arrangements for the meeting; and the database (or other storage means) houses the collected data.");*

Claim 4:

Krasnick as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *wherein the meeting information includes at least one of a meeting title, an attendee name, a meeting date, and a meeting location (page 4, ¶ 0046: which teaches that "all information that needs to be gathered from the attendee, including basic user information (e.g., an attendee name); save profile options; room preferences and room booking information; training and seminar selection" (e.g., a meeting title) are included in the meeting information);*

Claim 9:

Krasnick as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *further comprising a meeting reservation information sender that sends the meeting reservation information to a schedule management system that manages schedules about the attendees, wherein the meeting manager manages the schedule management system to display the schedules about the attendees based on the meeting registration information sent from the meeting reservation information sender (pages 3-4 ¶¶ 0036 and 0044: which teaches that "[t]he attendee management module 32 provides tools for the tracking, managing, and communicating with meeting attendees or other persons"(e.g., manages schedules about the attendees). Furthermore, Krasnick teaches "[t]he calendar 80 contains current deadlines and other dates listed for all meetings stored on the site" where Krasnick suggests that the calendar manages the schedules about the attendees. It is implicitly disclosed that this calendar is based on meeting registration and reservation information in order to display current deadlines and dates listed for all meetings);*

Claim 12:

Krasnick as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *further comprising a meeting minute sender that sends minutes of the meetings to a meeting bulletin board system that stores the minutes of the meetings (page 3, ¶¶ 0038 and page 4, ¶¶ 0046: which teaches that "[t]he community module 36 provides industry or other valuable information to coordinators via interactive web tools. The tools include chat rooms, bulletin boards, and message services for the exchange, viewing, or transfer of information." Krasnick teaches a communication module (e.g., a meeting minute sender) that provides valuable information (e.g., meeting-related data) where clients have access through interactive web tools (e.g., chat*

rooms, bulleting boards). In addition, "[t]he attendee site information architecture" provides an agenda area, which "is also purely informational, containing a printable meeting agenda created by the coordinator.");

- *wherein the meeting manager manages the meeting bulletin board system to store the meeting minutes sent from the meeting minute sender (page 1, ¶ 0009: which teaches that "the meeting management module prompts for and collects data pertinent to a proposed meeting, as well as analyzes the collected data and executes arrangements for the meeting; and the database (or other storage means) houses the collected data." Krasnick suggests that meeting management module gather and store all meeting-related data);*

16. As per **Claims 14 and 21**, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 2. Accordingly, claims 14 and 21 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 2, as described above.
17. As per **Claim 15**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 3. Accordingly, claim 15 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 3, as described above.
18. As per **Claim 16**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 4. Accordingly, claim 16 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 4, as described above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claims 5-7, 10 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasnick et al (US 2002/0032592 A1) hereinafter Krasnick as applied to claims 1-4, 9, 12-16 and 20-21 above in view of Copper (US 6,220,512 B1).

Claim 5:

Krasnick as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein the meeting manager manages the meetings based on the meeting record data and the attendee identification information stored in the meeting database* (page 1, ¶ 0009: which teaches that "the meeting management module prompts for and collects data pertinent to a proposed meeting, as well as analyzes the collected data and executes arrangements for the meeting; and the database (or other storage means) houses the collected data." Krasnick suggests that meeting management module gather and store all meeting-related);

Krasnick enables the addition of "add-on software tools" (Krasnick, page 2, ¶ 0026). Krasnick does not disclose the following limitation, however Copper in an analogous art of managing meetings for the purpose of monitoring time and/or cost related parameters of a meeting activity (column 2, lines 7-22) as shown, does:

- *a meeting time recorder that records identification information and entrance/exit times about the attendees in the meetings* (column 2, lines 7-18: which teaches that it "includes an electronic sensor, such as a bar code reader, for scanning an identification device of each attendee, such as an identification card, to acquire the individual unit time cost data" where identification information and entrance/exit times (e.g., "each time an attendee arrives at or withdraws from the meeting") are recorded. In addition, Copper teaches that "[t]he processor preferably extracts the individual unit time cost data from individual identification data acquired from the identification devices scanned by the electronic sensor.);

- *and a meeting database that stores meeting record data on the identification information and entrance/exit times about the attendees recorded by the meeting time recorder and associated with meeting identification codes, and store attendee identification information about the attendees associated with costs per unit time and assigned organizations, (column 2, lines 19-22, which Copper suggests that it includes "a storage device, and the processor may extract the individual unit time cost data from the storage device based upon an individual identifier code" (e.g., meeting identification codes) "acquired from the identification device scanned by the electronic sensor". In addition, Cooper teaches that "[t]he memory circuitry stores a total unit time cost parameter that is a sum of individual unit time cost data of each attendee of the meeting activity" (e.g., assigned organization));*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to monitor time and/or cost related parameters of a meeting activity as taught by Copper, to improve Krasnick Online meeting planner, thereby giving the predictable result of monitoring data with the purpose "to facilitate analysis of meeting activities, to promote accountability, efficiency and lower costs". (Copper, column 2, lines 42-43).

Claim 6:

Krasnick enables the addition of "add-on software tools" (Krasnick, page 2, ¶ 0026). Krasnick does not disclose the following limitation, however Copper in an analogous art of managing meetings for the purpose of calculating time and/or cost related parameters of a meeting activity (column 1, lines 49-58) as shown, does:

- *further comprising a meeting cost calculator that calculates meeting costs based on the entrance/exit times and the costs per unit time about the attendees in the meetings (column 1, lines 49-52: which teaches that "[t]he processor calculates" (e.g., a meeting cost calculator) "a metered cost parameter based upon the total unit time cost parameter stored" (e.g., cost per unit time) "in the memory circuitry*

and the elapsed time" (e.g., entrance/exit times) "data provided by the timer circuitry.");

- *wherein the meeting manager manages costs of the meetings based on the meeting costs calculated by the meeting cost calculator* (column 2, lines 29-32: which teaches that "[t]he interface panel may facilitate uploading of software or data into the system and/or downloading the parameters monitored and stored by the system for subsequent analysis"(e.g., cost managing). Copper suggests that information related to cost meeting is uploaded and/or downloaded for further analysis)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to calculate meeting cost based on time and cost per unit as taught by Copper, to improve Krasnick Online meeting planner, thereby giving the predictable result of optimizing the meeting time in order to keep "the meeting focused and productive" (Copper, column 2, lines 6-7) and "to facilitate analysis of meeting activities, to promote accountability, efficiency and lower costs". (Copper, column 2, lines 42-43).

Claim 7:

Krasnick enables the addition of "add-on software tools" (Krasnick, page 2, ¶ 0026). Krasnick does not disclose the following limitation, however Copper in an analogous art of managing meetings for the purpose of calculating time and/or cost related parameters of a meeting activity (column 1, lines 49-58) as shown, does:

- *wherein the meeting cost calculator calculates meeting costs by person, meeting, and organization* (Figure 1B, which it illustrates a meeting cost calculator for a meeting: "Metered Cost 30f" and column 1, lines 43-46: which teaches that "[t]he memory circuitry stores a total unit time cost parameter that is a sum of individual unit time cost data" of each attendee" (e.g., meeting costs by person) "of the meeting activity" (e.g., from each organization). Copper suggests that by calculating

cost per person and meeting, it is implicitly disclosed that a calculation by organization is made in order to calculate a total cost per meeting as shown in Figure 2 "TRION MARKETING CORP" and "METERED COST");

Claim 10:

Krasnick as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *to a schedule management system that manages schedules about the attendees* (pages 3-4 ¶ 0044: which teaches that "[t]he calendar 80 contains current deadlines and other dates listed for all meetings stored on the site" where Krasnick suggests that the calendar manages the schedules about the attendees);
- *wherein the meeting manager manages the schedule management system to store the meeting record data sent from the meeting record data sender* (page 1, ¶ 0009: which teaches that "the meeting management module prompts for and collects data pertinent to a proposed meeting, as well as analyzes the collected data and executes arrangements for the meeting; and the database (or other storage means) houses the collected data." Krasnick suggests that meeting management module gather and store all meeting-related);

Krasnick enables the addition of "add-on software tools" (Krasnick, page 2, ¶ 0026). Krasnick does not disclose the following limitation, however Copper in an analogous art of managing meetings for the purpose of monitoring meeting record data (column 2, lines 29-32) as shown, does:

- *further comprising a meeting record data sender that sends meeting record data* (column 2, lines 29-32: which teaches that "[t]he interface panel may facilitate uploading of software or data into the system and/or downloading the parameters monitored and stored by the system for subsequent analysis." Copper suggests that meeting record data is uploaded and/or downloaded for further analysis)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to calculate meeting cost based on time and cost per unit as taught by Copper, to improve Krasnick Online meeting planner, thereby giving the predictable result of optimizing the meeting time in order to keep "the meeting focused and productive" (Copper, column 2, lines 6-7) and "to facilitate analysis of meeting activities, to promote accountability, efficiency and lower costs". (Copper, column 2, lines 42-43).

21. As per **Claim 17**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 5. Accordingly, claim 17 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 5, as described above.
22. As per **Claim 18**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 6. Accordingly, claim 18 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 6, as described above.
23. As per **Claim 19**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 7. Accordingly, claim 19 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 7, as described above.
24. Claims 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasnick et al (US 2002/0032592 A1) hereinafter Krasnick as applied to claims 1-4, 9, 12-16 and 20-21 above in view of Cree et al (US 4,807,155) hereinafter "Cree".

Claim 8:

Krasnick as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein the meeting manager manages the meeting room reservation system to reserve the meeting rooms for the meetings based on the meeting registration information sent from the meeting reservation information sender (pages 3-4 ¶ 0044: which teaches that "[t]he calendar 80 contains current deadlines and other dates listed for all meetings stored on the site" where Krasnick suggests that the calendar manages the schedules about the attendees. It is implicitly disclosed that this calendar is based on meeting registration and reservation information in order to display current deadlines and dates listed for all meetings);*

Krasnick enables the addition of "add-on software tools" (Krasnick, page 2, ¶ 0026). Krasnick does not disclose the following limitation, however Cree in an analogous art of managing meeting reservation for the purpose of confirm meeting rooms' availability (column 3, lines 47-52) as shown, does:

- *further comprising a meeting reservation information sender that sends the meeting reservation information to a meeting room reservation system that manages a schedule for utilization of meeting rooms for the meetings* (column 3, lines 51-52 and column 4, lines 8-11: which Cree teaches "an automatic confirmation of the availability of the requested facilities at the time and place indicated in the meeting notice" (e.g., meeting reservation information) where "[o]n receipt of the notice at the conference room node the request is analyzed and if the room is available, a confirmation is sent back to the caller advising that the room is reserved for him.");

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use an electronic calendar to confirm meeting room's availability as taught by Cree, to improve Krasnick Online meeting planner, thereby giving the predictable result of knowing which "facilities and equipment that may not be available at the time of the meeting", "that a specific requested item is or is not available" and to know that "an alternate location that meets all of the elements of the request or in which the nature and content of the reply reflects that the suggested alternate location comes closer to fulfilling the request than the location originally specified"(Cree, column 2, lines 27-45) in order "to minimize the time and effort." (Cree, column 1, line 47).

Claim 11:

Krasnick as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein the meeting manager manages the mail server to notify the attendees of the meeting guidance based on the meeting registration information sent from the meeting registration information sender* (pages 3-4, ¶ 0033 and 0044: which

teaches that "[t]he meeting creation module 26 delivers the functions and features necessary to plan, create, execute, and manage one or more meetings and events" (e.g., meeting notifications) where "[t]he task manager 86 contains a list of the major tasks needed to plan a meeting, including a meeting checklist, agenda generation, and invitation creation information.");

Krasnick enables the addition of "add-on software tools" (Krasnick, page 2, ¶ 0026). Krasnick does not disclose the following limitation, however Cree in an analogous art of managing meeting notifications for the purpose to confirm attendees' presence in a meeting activity (column 25, lines 1-11) as shown, does:

- *further comprising a meeting registration information sender that sends the meeting registration information to a meeting mail server that notifies the attendees in the meeting of a meeting guidance, (Figure 3b which it illustrates meeting registration information when the meeting registration information is sent (e.g., "PF5=Send Notice") in order to notify the attendees (e.g., "Names List") and Figure 5, which it illustrates the attendees possible responses after receiving a notification "ENTER THE RESPONSE");*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the online meeting planning program of Krasnick with a meeting notification information as taught by Cree because it provides "a Resource data structure for storing data that is used by the system to automate the response for meeting facilities and equipment to a calendar owner calendaring a meeting and dispatching a meeting notice" (e.g., a meeting notification with registration information) "through the system to other calendar owners" (e.g., other attendees) (Cree, column 3, lines 53-58).

Conclusion

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- Yatman (US 4,445,181) discloses a meeting cost calculator and/or timer.
 - Curtis et al (US 4,626,836) discloses a method of scheduling meetings.
 - Scully et al (US 4,831,552) discloses a method for concurrently displaying entries from a plurality of different electronic calendars based on interactively.
 - Vincent (US 5,050,077) discloses a meeting scheduler with alternative listing.
 - Hotaling et al (US 5,124,912) discloses a meeting management device.
 - Griffing et al (US 5,303,145) discloses a method and apparatus for meeting confirmation in a data processing system.
 - Hager et al (US 5,317,683) discloses a method and apparatus for automated meeting agenda generation in a data processing system.
 - Baber et al (US 5,323,314) discloses a method and system for graphic representation of meeting parameters in a data processing system.
 - Freund (US 5,387,011) discloses a system and method for scheduling a meeting.
 - Okawa (US 5,933,810) discloses a reservation management apparatus and method for making arrangements according to degrees of importance of reservations.
 - Bisdikian et al (US 5,974,406) discloses an automated matching, scheduling, and notification system.
 - Zhu et al (US 2003/0167304 A1) discloses a distributed meeting management.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Nadja Chong** whose telephone number is **571.270.3939**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **BETH VAN DOREN** can be reached at **571.272.6737**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair> <<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to **571-273-8300**.

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window**:

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314.

/Nadja Chong/ Examiner, Art Unit 3623

13 July 2008

/Scott L. Jarrett/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623

